

1983. If all school districts had complied with this rule, much of the work required by AHERA would have already been completed. Furthermore, AHERA was signed into law in October 1980. If school district officials had moved immediately to comply with the law, the inspection and plan development stages would nearly be completed now.

On March 10, 1988, EPA announced that as of February 1, 1988, 5,183 inspectors have been accredited. Of that amount, 4,809 have also been certified to develop management plans. The number of EPA accredited training centers for inspectors and management planners is also increasing. In October, when the final AHERA rule was promulgated, there were 9 such training centers; in the February 10, 1988, Federal Register, EPA announced that there were 22 inspector and management planner courses. At the March briefing, EPA announced that there are now 42 courses with five more courses awaiting EPA approval.

Proponents of the legislation claim that there are not enough certified inspectors and management planners to complete the work by October 12, 1988. They assert that information on certified individuals is difficult to obtain. Proponents also claim that school districts do not have funds available from this fiscal year's budget to pay for inspecting schools and developing management plans. We question whether simply extending the deadlines by one year would solve these problems.

We, instead, encourage Congress to explore other means of assisting school districts and private schools in meeting the AHERA deadlines. The October 12, 1988, is still seven months away; during this time, Congress could work with the Environmental Protection Agency to require the Agency to expand the number of inspector and management planner certification courses offered, perhaps giving priority to school district personnel to enroll in the courses. EPA and the EPA Regional Centers could be required to develop a computerized list of accredited persons which would be made available to school district personnel. Finally, Congress could establish a one year loan program where school districts could borrow funds to conduct the inspections and develop the management plans, but would have to pay back the borrowed funds within one year.

In addition, the Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act Program (ASHAA), which provides loans, and in extreme cases, grants to school districts to assist in the cost of abating asbestos, needs to be funded at its full FY 1989 authorization level of \$125 million. EPA has estimated that the total cost of implementing AHERA will be approximately \$3 billion. In FY 1988, ASHAA only received \$40 million. Further, the President's FY 1989 budget request for ASHAA is only \$3.4 million—just enough funds to provide technical assistance. In light of the cost associated with AHERA, the ASHAA funds become an even more vital source of assistance for school districts.

By extending the deadlines, the health of our Nation's school children, teachers, and other school employees is being placed in jeopardy. Further, simply extending the AHERA deadlines does not solve the problems that the proponents of H.R. 3893 contend exist. By passing H.R. 3893, Congress would be sending a message to school districts that it is acceptable to continue to ignore or delay action on this serious health issue. We look forward to working with Congress in exploring other means of assisting

school districts in meeting the AHERA deadlines, and ask you to oppose H.R. 3893.

Sincerely,

American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; American Federation of Teachers; National Education Association; National PTA; Service Employees International Union; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association.

VIGIL FOR CONSCIENCE FOR POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DISSIDENTS IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1988

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, all Americans have the unique liberty to speak with the freedoms we possess, travel from country to country with ease, and worship in the manner we desire.

Soviet Jews, Christians, and prisoners of conscience do not have guaranteed rights of speech, movement, or religion and those dissidents who call attention to this void are persecuted, ignored, or imprisoned. In their nonconformity toward the Soviet system they are branded dissidents and are treated with censure.

I am currently involved with two cases of nonconformity to the Soviet system, one concerning a Jewish family who wants to be reunified with their daughter and son-in-law in the United States, and the other concerns a Lithuanian Catholic, Viktor Petkus, who is currently being held in the vast Soviet penal system for his religious beliefs and human rights activities. Each case is diverse in nature and circumstance but both illustrate the point about the lack of guaranteed liberty that Soviet Jewry, Soviet Christianity, and prisoners of conscience and faith have in the Soviet Union.

Lana Blekher lives in my district of northern Virginia. She and her husband were allowed to emigrate to the United States 7 years ago. Since that time she has tried to reunite her father, mother, and sister in the United States. Her family, however, was refused an exit permit because her father, Iakoz Scherbakov, worked in the aerospace industry 10 years ago and is alleged to still possess "state security secrets." While the case of the Scherbakovs is promised under the family reunification tenets of the Helsinki Final Act, Soviet officials have repeatedly refused their emigration applications even though Mr. Scherbakov has not worked in such a position for 10 years.

The Scherbakovs' situation is not an unfamiliar one. The imposition of "state security secrets" in the denial of exit applications of many Soviet Jews has arbitrarily slowed down processing, emigration, and delayed family reunification causing undue hardship and heartbreak to families waiting to be united.

The story of Viktor Petkus, on the other hand, is far removed from the case of the Scherbakovs but underscores an equally serious concern about Soviet attitudes toward religious beliefs. Viktor Petkus was jailed and sentenced three times since 1947. He has spent the greater part of his life in Soviet pris-

ons and labor camps for his participation in religious youth organizations and for his part in setting up a Baltic Helsinki human rights monitoring group. My office has taken Viktor's case under a program some of my colleagues on the Congressional Human Rights Caucus and I have sponsored called the "Christian Adoption Program." In adopting Viktor, we have written him and have circulated and signed letters with other Members of Congress asking General Secretary Gorbachev for Viktor's release. Even with the activity that has begun on behalf of Viktor Petkus, he still remains without his liberty, serving his sentence for his beliefs.

Present Soviet policy, as the stories of both Lana Blekher and Viktor Petkus illustrate, puts pressure on all religious believers and dissidents of conscience despite the Soviet Union's signature on such international affirmations of religious freedom and human rights as the U.N. Charter, the Universal Declaration of Religious Intolerance, and the Helsinki Final Act. In fact, at this very moment we find Soviet Christians and Jews who are persecuted, imprisoned, and not allowed to emigrate. Churches are closed, religious education is severely restricted and Christians and Jews are excluded from the privileges of special jobs and status because of their religious beliefs or wish to emigrate.

It is imperative that Americans take the time to act and speak with the freedoms we possess in solidarity with Soviet Jews, Christians and prisoners of conscience. Our Constitution is 200 years old and has fostered a system which guarantees the rights of speech, religion and movement. It is for this very reason that opportunities to speak out on behalf of Soviet religious and political dissidents are so important. Americans have the unique liberty to influence public and world opinion with our actions and words and, with the implied promises of General Secretary Gorbachev's policy of "glasnost," Members of Congress can have frank and open dialog with Soviet officials at the highest levels on human rights, emigration and religious liberty. We must seize this opportunity for Soviet Jewry, Soviet Christianity and prisoners of conscience.

S. 858, THE ABANDONED SHIPWRECK ACT OF 1987

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 28, 1988

Mr. DAVIS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the recent discovery of a number of historic shipwrecks, whether they be in Federal or State waters, underscores the interest the American public has in these underwater treasures. My office has been flooded with mail concerning S. 858 that we are considering today.

Recreational divers have urged me not to support these bills because of the danger that a State could shut the door on diving access to many of these wrecks, depriving them of an enjoyable and harmless hobby and driving those who operate diving operations out of business. Salvors also protest this legislation,

citing the Admiralty law provisions in our Constitution and the specter of huge penalties.

On the other hand, historic preservationists admonish me to vote for passage of the Senate bill with no changes, fearing that if the bill should be returned to the other Chamber, it would never see the light of day again and valuable pieces of our history would be lost due to unscrupulous salvors and divers.

I think the truth is somewhere between the two.

S. 858 is not a perfect bill and may create more problems than we realize now. Mr. SHUMWAY, our ranking member on the Oceanography Subcommittee, who has been a leader in developing responsible shipwreck legislation, has drafted a number of amendments which go a long way in fixing serious deficiencies. I have joined with him and others on the committee to file additional views in our committee's report on this legislation that detail these deficiencies. I hope that you will listen to him and seriously consider the points that he is making. Concerns have been voiced in Michigan that administration of this bill may undermine and complicate the management of shipwrecks in national lakeshores.

During the committee markup, I also prepared an amendment regarding diving safety, based on section 503 of my bill, H.R. 1922, which related directly to the activities surrounding shipwreck exploration recovery operations. I believe we should not forget our responsibility regarding maritime safety in any legislation we pursue. My proposed amendment would have recognized the use of the traditional divers flag and the right of the States to regulate recreational diving safety within their waters. In recent years confusion has developed between the requirements of Federal law under the Inland Navigation Rules Act of 1980 and various State regulations that govern diving activities. In particular, the proper signal to display when diving has been particularly troublesome. The States that have elected to regulate diving safety call for the display of a divers flag which is traditionally recognized as a bright or fluorescent red flag having a diagonal white stripe. The Federal rules, however, do not recognize this traditional safety signal.

In title II of Public Law 98-498 entitled "Marine Safety," two Coast Guard safety advisory bodies, the Rules of the Road Advisory Council and the National Boating Safety Advisory Council, were directed to study this problem and to make recommendations regarding safety and recreational diving operations and navigation. Both safety councils recommended that the regulation of recreational diving safety and the need for the display of the traditionally recognized divers flag was best left to the States and that no Federal legislation or regulation was required.

My proposal merely would have recognized the role of the States in regulating recreational diving safety and removed any ambiguity or conflict between the State regulations and the Federal navigation rules. No new Federal regulations would have been required as a result of this change. The provision would have emphasized that the display of the divers flag should not interfere with commercial navigation. Further, it would have encouraged the States to coordinate their regulations so that they are as uniform as possible and urges the U.S. Government to propose consideration of

the traditional divers flag as a safety measure by the international community. No interference with commercial vessel traffic would have been permitted.

Finally, this amendment would not have exempted divers from compliance with the Inland Navigational Rules where they apply. It would, however, have enabled the recreational diving community to enjoy its activities without the fear of technically being out of compliance with the Federal navigational rules which were designed for commercial operations. I hope we can correct this deficiency and pursue this needed statutory change either as an amendment to this bill or in separate legislation as soon as possible.

Further, I note that in the committee's report on section 5(b) of S. 858, we encourage the formation of a committee to balance the concerns of various interest groups in developing guidelines under the legislation. It is my expectation that the committee will be formed under the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Mr. Speaker, I do agree that we need to have Federal legislation which sorts out the conflicting court decisions regarding the control over these shipwrecks. Michigan, fortunately, does not share this problem, and offers a model to the rest of the coastal States for managing these important resources. I urge my colleagues to vote against S. 858 in the hope that we pass an amended bill that will create balanced shipwreck management programs, with access to all groups who have a stake in this area. It is our responsibility to remove the flaws in S. 858 and approve the best possible legislation.

DR. THOMAS E. EVERHART TO BE INAUGURATED AS PRESIDENT OF CALTECH

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 1988

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, Dr. Thomas E. Everhart will be inaugurated as president of the California Institute of Technology.

Inaugurations of presidents at Caltech have been relatively rare. There have only been a handful of chief executive officers at the institute over the past half-century. The inauguration is Caltech's opportunity to declare its abiding faith in the timeless value of higher education and basic scientific research.

It is also a time for the institute to reassert its unyielding yet comfortable commitment to excellence by selecting a man who shares that allegiance in both spirit and practice.

Dr. Everhart is a *magna cum laude*—with highest honors—graduate of Harvard University, where he received an A.B. degree in physics in 1953. He obtained a master's degree from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1955, and went on to earn a Ph.D. in engineering from Cambridge University, Cambridge, England in 1958.

That same year, Dr. Everhart joined the University of California at Berkeley, where he served in the department of electrical engineering and computer science for more than 20 years. In addition to teaching and research,

he also served as chairman of the department during 1972-77.

In January 1979, he became dean of the College of Engineering at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. In August 1984 he left Cornell to assume the chancellorship at the Urbana-Champaign campus of the University of Illinois where he remained until accepting the presidency at Caltech in September 1987.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Everhart is a national spokesman on science and technology. He chairs the General Motors Science Advisory Committee, and chaired the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory Scientific and Educational Advisory Committee from 1980 to 1985. He serves as a member of the R.R. Donnelley Technical Advisory Council; the Engineering Research Board, National Research Council, Commission on Engineering and Technical Systems; and the National Academy of Engineering Educational Advisory Board.

His main areas of interest and expertise have been in the research and development of scanning electron microscopes, electron beams as applied to semiconductor analysis and fabrication, and electron beam recording. In 1984, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers honored him with its Centennial Medal, which recognizes outstanding achievements in electrical and electronics engineering.

Throughout his academic career, Everhart has maintained a close relationship with industry, and has been a consultant to such firms as Ampex Research and Development Laboratories, Bell Laboratories, Hughes Research Laboratories, IBM Research Laboratory, Watkins-Johnson Co., and Westinghouse Research Laboratories.

Dr. Everhart has strong international ties. He was a Marshall scholar at Cambridge University while pursuing his doctorate, and has been a visiting professor at the Institut fuer Aggewandte Physik, Tuebingen, West Germany, and Waseda University, Tokyo.

He is a member of many scholarly and honorary societies including Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, American Association for the Advancement of Science, National Academy of Engineering, Boehmische Physikalische Gesellschaft, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and Electron Microscopy Society of America. He has held a Guggenheim Fellowship and a National Science Foundation Senior Postdoctoral Fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to announce to my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the inauguration of Dr. Thomas E. Everhart as president of the California Institute of Technology, and as the Representative of the 22d Congressional District of California, I am delighted to welcome Dr. and Mrs. Everhart and their children to Caltech, to Pasadena, and the State. I have no doubt this new association will be fruitful for all concerned.